Application No. Applicant(s) UMEMOTO ET AL. 09/504.438 Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 2654 David D. Knepper All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) David D. Knepper (for PTO). (2) Cathy Voisinet (for Applicant). Date of Interview: 8 Jul 2003 Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative e)⊠ No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: . Claim(s) discussed: 1,11,14 and 15. Identification of prior art discussed: Kobayashi. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant will suggest changes to some claims related to "other information relating to a selected topic". Applicant argues that changing the information is claimed in regard to switching such as in claims 14 and 15 which distinguishes over Kobayashi who only replays information. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE. OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required